11/9/75
11/9/75

Mr. John Crewdson
The New York Times
1920 L. St., NW
Wash., D.C.

Dear John,

Our last night's conversation confirmed two fears I had when you left here, first that the considerable literary liabilities of Post Mortem would present a problem to you and next that you might get caught up in the nation's whodunit fever. I refer to your unanswerable question about the back wound in particular. I could have done quite reasonable conjecturing about it but elected not to. I am not and will not become part of the whodunit approach, one doomed to disaster and one that cannot be either fully responsible or serve the purposes to which I have devoted so many years.

There simply is too much in the book for the most diligent of fine reporters to be able to comprehend, partly because there is no reporter who can have the factual basis necessary. You will remember that I told you beginning in 1967 I had to recast my role, essentially into the one who would make a record for history. Book publisher and media attitudes and the carryings-on of others supposedly on my side gave me the choice between this and quitting. I have several limitations , primarily a lack of facilities and help. Thus there could be no editing without my giving up much else that, had I, would not have been done. The combination of these and other factors make real problems for me and for reporters.

It is because I am aware of these that I went to the trouble of preparing a list of pages for you to go over. You preferred to be what to you was independent and I felt I could not appear to be telling you how to regard your story. The result is that you got bogged down in the enormous detail, I fear. I did suggest to you that you skip part one entirely so you could get immediately into the enormity of the "new evidence" for which all those with no other answers have been clamoring. Regardless of the kinds of things you have been hearing and seeing, almost all of the first part is "new" but is less sensational. But the parts that follow are almost without exception entirely "new" and are entirely my own work.

If you want, although the coming week will be a difficult one for me, I'll take the time to discuss the possibilities of the meaning(s) of the back wound being lower than officially represented. My own view is that all the officials knew it, lied and perjured about it, and that when this was the investigation of the assassination of a President that in itself is major news. Regardless of what can be attributed to the fact of the actual location of the wound. However, I guarantee you that I can without repetition give you a full half hour of possible explanations that may not have occurred to you, if this is what you want. I'd hope not. In my view this is a proper interest for the future and represents reporting not of the new evidence in this book, which is about evidence, suppression of evidence and official corruption, not about who offed JFK. If you still want to continue with this line of thinking rather than what I would regard as reporting of the book and its contents, I suggest that you not hang up on the preconception that full-jacketed military ammo only was used in the crime. There is enormously more, but this can be a hangup that can obliterate all else, whether or not such ammo was used.

I hope you will not regard this simplification as an effort to intrude into your view of your story. This book, among other things, has collected from formerly suppressed official sources what I regard as irrefutable evidence that the official investigation set out to be a non-investigation and reported falsely, knowingly falsely, about each and every one of the known and admitted wounds. It has been read by lawyers who assure that this evidence is unassailable and would stack in any unbiased court.

In this simplification I have gone further. I have specified and proven who did what to this end, who was witting and silent, how the covering up was begun the first moment and by whom and how and by whom it was peppetuated. It will not endear me to have included the press, but making a full record and meeting my own standards of personal and professional integrity required this of me.

My purpose was not to solve the crime. My purposes did include laying a basis for the hope that there could be enough pressure generated so that to the degree this can still be done there might be the effort by the only means I consider have a chance, official action.

(As some of the CIA's files on me that came after you left show, the CIA understood this clearly from the first. There is none of the small percentage of their files they have given me that says anything else about my purposes. I am not going to release them now, although you can see them because as I told you I intend to proceed with this in my own way, with or without prior sale of ancillary rights. It will at some point be in court because I have proof they are that hungup on me, my work and this unique approach.)

Aside from the investigation reported I believe I have resorted to unusual means to accomplish my objective. I have at every point put my head on the block. In this book I am subject to charges of criminal libel. I don't know how many writers run this risk to bring the truth out. I do name names and I do attribute specific felonies to those named.

On hard news: It is new that there is certification and multiple proof that each of the President's known wounds and at least one of Connally's was deliberately lied about under oath. In the investigation of the crime of the century, with all these biggies in charge and when all of history turned on that crime? And when in more than a decade such proofs have not been collected and verified? By more than one official source and document in each and every case?

The anterior neck would was different in nature and located other than where officially represented. The rear non-fatal wound ditto. The head or fatal wound was four inches - a major percentage of the area of a head - other than where alleged. All this means the shooting could not have been done as represented and it also means that regardless of those involved there was a) a conspiracy to kill the President, based on hard evidence, tangible evidence, not testimony or conjecture; and b) an enormous number of people, including some of the most eminent, for whatever reason or reasons, knew this and reported otherwise. I have my own opinions of motive but I avoid them because I am hoping you will center on hard evidence which to me is hard news.

The hiding of evidence and how and by whom, the perjury about it (alternative, a remote possibility, the refusal to do the necessary technical work) to me are news and in this case fact not confronted or even rebutted in open court. Even the FBI's certification that I know more about the subject than anyone in the FBI is to me news. And not because it refers to me. I know of no instance in which the FBI has ever said this, regardless of motive.

I think it is hard news that I caught the FBI lying, in this case also perjury, about what it did and did not do. The proofs are in facsimile, not limited to affidavits on the material directly refuting each other.

On these and many more aspects I will face any confrontation by any one or any combination. More, I have initiated the steps for this. I expect all the others to cop out. But when kids at the University of Maryland asked me to appear there, tentatively on the 24th, I suggested confrontation and told them the name of every former Warren Commission lawyer in or near the Washington area. This is not new with me as an approach. With my second book four of these lawyers gave up a TV show when they learned they'd be in a gangup against me alone. I did the same thing with Frame-Up and Percy Foreman and Art Hanes. Foreman fold with his makeup still on, so fast the highlight listing on the Times' TV page could not be changed. I have the station's tape and one made by a young

man in the studio audience. There may have been others who have written on controversial subject?who have subjected themselves and their work to this kind of testing and personal hazard but I know of none. My point here is not boasting. I eschew personal publicity. Mo will tell you that I would say nothing for use when we were in Memphis together. I think he will also say that the combination represented by the State did not even try to lay a hand on the evidence I developed.

In fact I have declined to be on the King part of the coming CBS special. I am aware that with this book's appearance coinciding with that coast-to-coast prime-time appearance the refusal is a personal sacrifice.

My approach, my beliefs and my objectives may not be the normal ones and this also may present problems to those who do not know me in reporting what I do.

I have taken this time not to influence you. I do not believe that, if I had the intent I could anyway. It is my hope that this hasty, off-the-top reaction to what I took from our last night's conversation is not inaccurate and that reading what you will yet read of this book may present fewer problems to you if you understand me and what I seek in the book better.

Financially and physically I am limited but to the degree I can I will make copies available to you, either on a loan basis where I have duplicates, as of the picture of the front of the neck, or by letting you make copies from those documents of which I do not have duplicates.

I will be trying for a Friday press conference in Washington. I will be calling those you were kind enough to tell me about at AP and UPI. If you have any other such suggestions, I can use them and will appreciate them. I'll be leaving for an medical appointment about 12:30 Tuesday and for an evening commitment in Washington that night. Except for possible local errands - I can drive up to 15 minutes without too much discomfort - I expect to be here Wednesday and Thursday. If I can arrange the Friday press conference I'll be in Washington then and expect to be home Saturday. I leave for debate with Belin Tuesday morning. I'll not be back until Wednesday night because I'll spend part of Wednesday with Jimmy Ray.

Whenever I am here, please feel free to ask anything you may want of me.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg